DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 617 UD 021 020

TITLE	ESEA Title 1 Workshop on Neglected & Delinquent Children (Ellenville, NY, April 25-27, 1979).
INSTITUTION	New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton.; New York State Education Dept., Albany.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Puerto Rico State Dept. of Education, Hato Rey.; Virgin Islands Government Dept. of Education, Charlotte Amalie.
PUB DATE	Apr 79
NOTE	50p.; Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction.
AVAILABLE FROM	New York State Education Department, Room 878 EBA, Albany, NY 12234.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Neglect; *Compensatory Education; Conference Proceedings; *Delinquency; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutional Schools; Mathematics Instruction; Needs Assessment; *Program Administration; Reading Instruction; School Districts
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This is the report of a workshop on the topic of educational services provided through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to neglected and delinquent children. The workshop was cosponsored by the United States Office of Education and State Education Departments in Federal Region II (New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands), and was held in April 1979 in Ellenville, New York. Included in the report are background information on the workshop, an agenda, a list of participants, and the contents of presentations on (1) reading instruction, (2) needs assessment in institutions for neglected and delinquent children, (3) mathematics instruction, (4) supervision of Title I programs, (5) Title I projects for neglected and delinquent children, (6) volunteer programs in institutional settings, and (7) the relationship of local education agencies with institutional programs. Results of the participants' evaluations of the workshop are attached to the report. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195617

SEP 19 1980

ESEA TITLE I WORKSHOP ON

NEGLECTED & DELINQUENT CHILDREN

CO-SPONSORED BY USOE & STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS IN FEDERAL REGION II (NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, PUERTO RICO & THE VIRGIN ISLANDS).

April 25-27

Fallsview Hotel, Ellenville, NY

PROCEEDINGS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John L. House
U.S. Education Dept.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD021020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Workshop Planning	1
Master Agenda	2
Participant List	4
Candid Pictures	7
Reading Instruction	
Anthony Sarlo	9
Carole Singer, Peggy Jeffres, Donald Munday	14
Needs Assessment	
Jerry Rice	17
Ralph Sims	25
Mathematics Instruction	
Pam Culver, Jonathan Panzer, C. DiCarlo	28
Lynn Richbart	31
Supervision	
Lynn Gilmore	34
Group Home	
Fred Kershko	35
Volunteer Programs	
Tracy Smith	37
LEA Relationship with Institutional Programs	
Robert Darden	39
Evaluation	42

WORKSHOP PLANNING

In the summer of 1978 the United States Office of Education requested that New York and New Jersey collaborate and co-sponsor with USOE a workshop on neglected and delinquent children for Federal Region II. New York accepted the task of organizing the activity and agreed to invite the territories of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Mr. Leo Denault of the New York State Education Department was named the chairman of the workshop and he organized an ad hoc steering committee to assist. In addition he contracted with the Regional Planning Center of the Albany-Schoharie-Schenectady BOCES to assist in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the workshop. The steering committee, comprised of approximately 20 people from New York and New Jersey, met monthly in the fall of 1978 and put together a list of possible topics to be developed for the workshop. This list was narrowed to a workable number by incorporating a computerized survey that the Regional Planning Center prepared.

The workshop was developed to provide staff members from institutions for neglected and delinquent children the opportunity to examine successful practices, share promising ideas and interact with federal, state and local personnel over common concerns.

The program focused on three major issues:

- Programmatic Concerns
- Rules and Regulations
- Roles and Responsibilities

The workshop was held on April 25-27, 1979 at the Fallsview Hotel in Ellenville, New York.

NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CONFERENCE

MASTER AGENDA

SESSIONS	Room A READING INSTRUCTION	Room B PROGRAM EVALUATION DESIGN	Room C NEEDS ASSESSMENT	Aquarius Room MATH INSTRUCTION	Celebrity Room SUPERVISION OF TITLE I PROGRAMS
1 Wednesday 2:30-3:50	Anthony Sarlo, Assistant Superintendent of Ed. Programs, Training School for Boys and Girls, New Jersey	Bruce Fredrick, Research Scientist, New York Division for Youth Joan Williams, Assistant Research Scientist, New York Division for Youth	Ralph Sims, Assistant Director, Title I, New Jersey	Pam Culver, Math Lab Instructor, Tryon School, Johnstown, NY	Thomas Brown, New Jersey Department of Education
2 Wednesday 4:00-5:30	Group rescheduled	Bruce Fredrick, Research Scientist, New York Division for Youth Joan Williams, Assistant Research Scientist, New York Division for Youth	Jerry Rice, Evaluation Consultant, Regional Planning Center, Albany, New York	Anthony Sarlo, Asst. Superintendent of Ed. Programs, Training Schools for Boys and Girls, New Jersey	Lynn Gilmore, Title I, New York Dept. of Correctional Services
3 Thursday 9:00-10:00	Room - Fantasy	RULES AND REGULATIONS - PAT MANCINI, USOE, STATE REPRESENTATIVE			
4 Thursday 10:30-Noon	Anthony Sarlo, Assistant Superintendent of Ed. Programs, Training School for Boys and Girls, NJ	Eileen Kelly, Evaluator, NY State Education Dept.	Jerry Rice, Evaluation Consultant, Regional Planning Center, Albany, New York	Lynn Richbart, Assoc. NY State Education Dept. Bureau of Math Ed.	Cynthia Bell, Project Director, NY Office of Substance Abuse Service
5 Thursday 1:45-3:15	Room - Fantasy *Pat Mancini substituted for Gerald Boyd who, at the last minute, was unable to attend	ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS - PAT MANCINI*, USOE			
6 Thursday 3:30-5:00	Carole Singer, Coor. Reading Programs, NY Div. for Youth	Eileen Kelly, Evaluator NY State Education Dept.	Ralph Sims, Assistant Director, Title I, New Jersey	Anthony Sarlo, Asst. Supt. of Ed. Programs, Training Sch. Boys & Girls	Lynn Gilmore, Title I, NY Dept of Correctional Services
7 Friday 8:45-10:00	Group rescheduled	Eileen Kelly, Evaluator	Jerry Rice, Evaluation Consult., Regional Plan. Center, Albany, NY	Pam Culver, Math Lab Instructor, Tryon School, Johnstown, NY	Cynthia Bell, Project Director, NY Office of Substance Abuse Service
8 Friday 10:30-Noon	Carole Singer, Coordinator Reading Programs, NY Div. for Youth	Eileen Kelly, Evaluator NY State Education Dept.	Ralph Sims, Assistant Director, Title I, New Jersey	Lynn Richbart, Assoc. NYSED, Bureau of Math Education	Thomas Brown, Coord. New Jersey Department of Education

ROOM - EAST ROOM

Group F

SESSION 1	Group Home, Fred Keshko, Associate, Title I, New York State Education Department April 25, 2:30 - 3:50
SESSION 2	Bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) Program - Petrita Hernandez, Statewide Bilingual Coordinator, New York State Department Correctional Services April 25, 4:00 - 5:30
SESSION 4	Volunteer Programs: Correctional Settings - Tracy Smith, Teacher/Coordinator of Learning Lab, Skillman Training School for Boys April 26, 10:30 - 12:00
SESSION 6	LEA Relationship with Institutional Programs - Robert Darden, Acting Administrative Coordinator of Federal Programs, Newark Public Schools, New Jersey April 26, 3:30 - 5:00
SESSION 7	Competency Testing and Competency Programs - Kenneth Ormiston, Associate, Educational Testing, New York State Education Department April 27, 8:45 - 10:00
SESSION 8	Conflicting Roles of State Agencies - John McDowell - Assistant Supervisor of Education, Skillman School for Boys April 27, 10:30 - 12:00

PARTICIPANT LIST

Barbara Abraham	Alba-Neck Halfway House, NY
William Almedina	Odyssey House, Inc.
Jimmy Armstrong	Abbott School, N.Y.C.
Sandy Avery	Harlem Confrontation, N.Y.C.
Mary Anne Awad	Department of Mental Hygiene
Ralph Baxter	Samaritan Halfway Society, NY
Cynthia Bell (Presenter)	Division of Substance Abuse Service
Gloria Bennett	Queens Village Committee for Mental Health
Diane Booker	Elmcor
Thomas Brown (Presenter)	New Jersey Department of Education
Sister Immaculata Capson	St. Catherine's Center, NY
Rozanne Carter	Gustavus Adolphus Learning Center, NY
Joseph Casino	Queens Village Committee for Mental Health
Ira Certner	New York State Education Department
Joseph Constantino	New York State Education Department
Priscilla Crumel	Camden County Youth Center, NJ
Pam Culver (Presenter)	Tyron School, NY
Robert Darden (Presenter)	Newark Public Schools-Board of Education
Joan D'Emic	New Hope Manor, NY
Leo Denault	Title I - NYS Education Department
Efrain Dennis	New York Division of Substance Abuse Services
Michael DeSantis	New York State Education Department
Robert Dixon	George Herlich Juvenile Quarters, NJ
William Flannigan	New York State Education Department
Richard Fogel	Project Return, N.Y.C.
Bruce Frederick (Presenter)	New York Department for Youth
Anne Fury	New Hope Manor, NY
Don Gardner	Regional Planning Center, NY
Ernestine Gaskins	Project Return, N.Y.C.
Lynn Gilmore (Presenter)	NYS Dept. of Correctional Services
Mary Gilroy	Abbott School, N.Y.C.
Herbert Goldberg	Odyssey House, Inc., NY
Rochelle Goldberg	Odyssey House, Inc., NY
Rosa J. Guzman de Blasini	Social Treatment Centers, Puerto Rico
Petrita Hernandez (Presenter)	NYS Dept. of Correctional Services
John House (Presenter)	New York State Education Department
Paul Hughes	New York State Education Department
Stephen Jacabson	Renaissance Project, NY
Peggy Jeffres	Camp Cass, NY
Charlotte Jewett	New York Division of Substance Abuse Services
Consuelo Juarbe	Puerto Rico State Education Department

Participant List (Continued)

Lucy Kassman	Auburn School District, NY
Eileen Kelly	Associate, New York State Education Department
Fred Kershko	New York State Education Department
Fred Knewstub	Alpha House, NY
Steve LaMantia	New York Department for Youth
Nydia Loyola De Gonzalez	Puerto Rico Department of Education
James Lucey	New York Department for Youth
Pat Mancini (Presenter)	USOE, Washington D.C.
Sylvia Maples	Project Return, N.Y.C.
Chet Mauro	Youth Hospitality House
Sister Evelyn McCarte	St. Catherine's Center, NY
John McDowell (Presenter)	Skillman School for Boys
Timothy McLaren	Hope Farm, UFSD, NY
Javier Mercada	Department of Social Services, Puerto Rico
Jean Mingin	Auburn School District, NY
Gladys Moscowitz	Renaissance Project, NY
Don Munday	Goshen Center, NY
Martin Murphy	Tecumseh Elementary School, NY
Michele Nowosad	New York State Education Department
George Nuccera	Belleville Board of Education, NY
Leticia Nunez	Samaritan Halfway Society, NY
José L. Olivo	Espada, N.Y.C.
Kenneth Ormiston (Presenter)	New York State Education Department
Robert Ortiz	Espada, N.Y.C.
Joseph Orton	SUC Fredonia, NY
Johathan Panzer	South Lansing, NY
Francine Pendola	Samaritan Halfway Society, NY
John Perretti	Renaissance Project, NY
Paula Perstein	Samaritan Halfway Society, NY
Mary C. Pratt	Randolph Children's Home-School, NY
Mary Previte	Camden County Youth Center, NJ
Mary Lou Prichett	Reachout, NY
Myrna Prieto	New York State Education Department
Jerry Rice (Presenter)	Regional Planning Center, NY
Lynn Richbart (Presenter)	New York State Education Department
John Richman	Venderheydan Hall, NY
Roberta Rinaldo	Yorktown UFSD-Wiltwyck, NY
Antonio Rivera	Odyssey House, Inc. NY
Lance Rodgers	New York State Education Department
Mark Rossa	Samaritan Halfway Society, NY
Anthony Sarlo	Skillman Training School for Boys, NJ
Dan Savage	Confrontation, Inc., NY
José Segura	Espada, N.Y.C.
Ellen Simonelli	Abbott School, N.Y.C.
Ralph Sims	New Jersey Department of Education
Carolyn Sincoff	Essex County Youth House

Participant List (Continued)

Carole Singer (Presenter)	New York Department for Youth
Erma Smith	Essex County Youth House
Esther Smith	Girls Center, NJ
Tracy Smith (Presenter)	Skillman School for Boys, NJ
Anita Emerterio Strods	Reachout, NY
Sylvia Telchin	NY Division of Special Education, N.Y.C.
Shirley Tempro	NY Division of Special Education, N.Y.C.
Heather Thomas	Alpha House, NY
Eleanor Turner	Union County Juvenile Facility, NJ
Maria Vandor	New York Division of Substance Abuse
Frances Venezia	ILC Highland, NY
Susan Volin	Samaritan Halfway Society, NY
Leona Ward	Samaritan Halfway Society, NY
Jospeh Whalen	Green Chimneys School, NY
Joan Williams (Presenter)	New York Department for Youth

READING INSTRUCTION

PRESENTER: Anthony Sarlo - Assistant Supervisor of Education,
New Jersey Training School for Boys & Girls

I. WHAT READING IS

A. Reading is a process.

B. Reading is a developmental process.

C. Reading is a complex process.

D. Reading is one facet of the language arts.

II. WHAT READING IS NOT

A. Reading is not a subject.

B. Reading is not a natural maturational process.

III. BASIC PRINCIPLES IN THE TEACHING OF READING

A. Learning to read is a complicated process and is sensitive to a variety of pressures. Too much pressure or the wrong kind of pressure may result in non-learning.

B. Learning to read is an individual process.

C. Pupil differences must be a primary consideration in reading instruction.

D. Reading instruction should be thought of as an organized, systematic, growth-producing activity.

E. Proper reading instruction depends on the diagnosis of each pupil's weakness and needs.

F. The best diagnosis is useles unless it is used as a blueprint for instruction.

G. No pupil should be forced to be expected to attempt to read material which at the moment he is incapable of reading.

H. Reading is a process of getting meaning from printed word symbols. It is not merely a process of making conventionalized noises associated with these symbols.

I. Any given technique, practice or procedure is likely to work better with some students than with others. Hence, teacher of reading must have a variety of approaches.

J. Learning to read is a long-term developmental process extending over a period of years.

K. The concept of readiness would be extended upward to all grades.

L. Early in the learning process the pupil must acquire ways of gaining independence in identifying words whose meanings are known to him but which are unknown to him as sight words.

M. Pupils should not be in the classroom if they have emotional problems sufficiently serious to make them uneducable at the moment or if they interfere with or disrupt the learning process.

N. Emphasis should be on prevention rather than cure. Reading problems should be detected early and corrected before they deteriorate into failure-frustration-reaction cases.

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM

A. Discovery of pupils who are in need of remedial help.

1. Those who are one or more years retarded in reading skills as determined by standardized test scores.

2. Those who demonstrate a lack of ability in a particular reading skill as observed by the classroom teacher. (Teacher referral)

B. Use of valid Diagnostic tests to ascertain specific achievement and needs.

C. Discovery of individual pupil interests.

D. Location of interesting material adapted to developing specific deficient skills.

E. Remedial sessions are scheduled only at such times that the pupil is not tired or when such sessions will not cause the pupil not to participate in activities which are particularly interesting or important to him.

F. Every effort is made to make the remedial session generally ego-supportive and interesting.

G. Use of testing material which indicates small gains as a means toward ego-support.

I. Listening skills are emphasized with each pupil.

J. Informal tests are an integral part of the program and are utilized to counterpoint standardized test scores which generally tend to overrate the abilities of slow and reluctant readers.

K. Every effort is made to ascertain the instructional and frustration level of each pupil enrolled in the program.

L. Instruction is aimed at the instructional level of each pupil.

M. A program of instruction, based on individual needs and achievements of each pupil, is designed and implemented.

N. A variety of materials, both hard and software, are utilized. Such materials are sequentially and developmentally organized and are geared to harmonize with pupil interests.

O. Every effort is made to insure that the area set aside for remedial instruction is pleasant. cheerful, and conducive to maximum pupil development.

P. Every effort is made to return the pupil to the normal reading program as soon as possible.

Q. Follow-up procedures are implemented in order to "track" the students after he is returned to normal instruction so as to provide input to the evaluation of the remedial instruction provided.

R. The remedial program is seen as supplemental to the normal reading program.

S. It is evaluated and refined on a regular basis.

V. PRINCIPLES OF INSTRUCTION FOR THE REMEDIAL PUPIL

Any pupil whose reading instructional level is below that of his grade level can be properly classified as a retarded reader. Those pupils who are reading at two or more levels below grade level should be placed in environments where special remedial instruction is possible. Those pupils who are reading at only one level below grade level can also be placed in such an environment if such factors as staff and students population so allow. The Reading Laboratory and adjoining reading area is ideal for such special instruction.

If one is to realize a reasonable amount of success in dealing with these kinds of pupils, a number of important considerations must be kept in mind.

A. Instruction for these pupils must be highly organized. After studying the test scores and other data, a careful outline should be made of the types of exercises and materials available which will serve to alleviate the existing deficiencies of the pupil. The pupil who shows a haphazard pattern of success in reading is in need of a carefully structured program where a sequence of learning activities is in evidence.

B. The pupil must be able to realize at least a limited amount of success during the treatment process. The old saying, "Nothing builds success like success" is certainly true with respect to the reading retardate. Typically, these students are older and have met a long series of defeats and are convinced that they cannot be successful in the area of reading. One must be optimistic and call attention to each bit of improvement registered by the pupil, regardless to how small the improvement might be. A pleasant atmosphere should always prevade and a relaxed situation should be evidence. Building the confidence of these pupils is one of the most basic and important of tasks.

C. A variety of materials and exercises should be employed which are commensurate with a given student's reading needs. Due to the complexity of the reading act, no one set of materials or exercises is so complete that it will suffice for all needs. These pupils demand the different --the unusual--if their attention is to be captured. The use of informal, homemade devices may be of more value than highly sophisticated, commercial gadgets and books. Materials should not be changed merely for the sake of change. One program should be used long enough to give it a fair trial.

D. The psychological structure of each pupil should be studied as much as possible with the help of qualified persons who can administer various psychological tests. Many retarded readers have poor self-concepts and have a low estimate of their personal worth. Gaining the pupil's loyalty and confindence should be one of the first tasks. Unfortunately, some ot these pupils have been made the object of ridicule by other pupils and even by their parents in some cases. The Remedial teacher must attempt to erase this image.

E. Careful selections of pupils for the remedial programs should be undertaken by both administrators and teachers. Pupils selected should possess at least a low average intelligence as measured by individual tests which have been

administered by qualified examiners. Pupils who are in the educable mentally retarded category are in need of special instruction apart from the usual techniques employed by the remedial specialist. At no time should the remedial reading room or laboratory be a "dumping ground" for pupils who are unruly or who are emotionally disturbed.

F. The remedial program must be viewed by the pupils as an opportunity rather than as a punishment. Pupils should not be purposely removed from enjoyable activities and "sent" to the remedial reading area.

G. Continuous evaluation should be in evidence at all times. Reading growth in the various skill areas should be a constant aid to the teacher in making decisions relating to materials and techniques which appear to be of most value for a given pupil.

DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TITLE I READING PROGRAM IN THE NEW YORK STATE DIVISION FOR YOUTH

PRESENTERS: Carole J. Singer - Coordinator of Reading Programs
Division for Youth

Peggy Jeffres - Reading Lab Teacher
Division for Youth

Donald Munday - Reading Lab Teacher
Division for Youth

In 1971, the State Training School System was transferred from the Department of Social Services to the Division for Youth. This transfer reflected the State's decision to consolidate all youth-related services into a single agency. The Division for Youth now serves a large residential population, 13-17, in various facility types such as:

Training Schools
Secure Centers
Camps
START Centers
Youth Development Centers
Special Residential Centers
Group Homes

Title I Reading components, serving approximately 1,700 youth, are in place in all the facilities that fall under the above types. They range from complete Labs in the larger schools, campus and centers to tutorial programs in the group homes, and supplement existing State purpose classes in the various academic areas.

Reading Labs, though differing perhaps in size, follow the same basic design. Each is staffed by qualified reading teacher, and in many instances, a full or part-time assistant.

The Labs are based on a diagnostic/prescriptive approach as outlined in the DFY Reading Manual. Each youth works upon a program specifically designed to meet his/her needs based upon criterion-reference tests (diagnostic, pre/post) teacher judgment and student/teacher conferences.

Daily programs are written in behavioral terms on program sheets kept in individual student folders. Included on the Daily Program Sheet, along with specific assignments, are a choice of materials to be used, teacher/student comments on daily progress, conference notes, and CRT mastery information. A student's Daily Program Sheet is designed so that he/she moves in and out of approximately three interest/instructional areas of the Lab during each class.

The teacher also maintains a folder for each participant which includes copies of placement, diagnostic and pre/post tests, assessment of strengths and weaknesses, initial and updated prescription, interest inventory, samples of student work, completed Daily Program Sheets and cumulative record forms.

The Reading Labs are equipped with a wide selection of materials and programs on various interest and instructional levels. The materials were chosen to provide for a variety of possible approaches and modalities. It is the responsibility of the teacher to match the right material and proper instructional format to each youth's specific needs using his strengths to remediate his weaknesses.

A Reading Skills Prescription Notebook (RSPN) has been developed to assist the teacher to prescribe appropriate material. The notebook lists each skill taught in the Lab and the material available to teach that skill. The format of the RSPN is such that a teacher can easily locate material in the Lab for a specific skill and choose from a variety of "types" (e.g., games, workbooks, audio/visual) depending upon individual needs.

The physical design of the Lab has been planned to provide the most conducive atmosphere for learning. The area housing the Reading Lab is furnished and arranged in a non-traditional fashion utilizing carpeting, colorful drapes and moveable furniture, e.g., chairs, tables, bookcases. Many of the Reading Labs also contain a couch, easy chairs, and end tables. The design of the Lab

also includes areas for small and large group instruction, individual learning stations and activity centers.

Generally six students comprise each class although this may vary according to type of facility and the ability of the individual group. A remedial student must receive a minimum of three periods of instruction in Reading per week in the Lab. Each period is from 40-60 minutes in length. It is strongly encouraged that the lowest level youth are scheduled into the program each day.

In-Service training of staff, conducted by the DFY Reading Program Coordinator, takes place throughout the year through facility visits, regional workshops and Statewide conferences.

The Lab staff provides classroom teachers and facility Education Supervisors/Coordinators with the results and an interpretation of diagnostic information and remedial plans for each student. They also work closely with other teachers to discuss programs relevant to the needs of each client.

The DFY Reading Labs, though supplemental in nature, are a vital and very successful part of the total education program in the Division for Youth.

PLANNING AND THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT PROCESS

PRESENTER: Jerry A. Rice - Evaluation Consultant, Regional Planning Center
Albany, New York

Most educators, when they hear the words "planning" and "needs assessment" in context with an educational organization believe them to be very technical processes, hard to understand, busy work, and done only by consultants hired to do those kinds of things.

Actually the processes of planning and needs assessing are integral part of life for most people. We plan our day's activities, either formally by listing each time and task or informally by making a visual agenda in our heads. We usually plan what we will wear each day, often taking into account the weather, the activities of the day, etc. And all of these daily planning activities utilize an assessment of needs. For example, if I am to have a board meeting on Monday I will need to wear my dark suit, and I will need to get my blue shirt cleaned.

As planning and needs assessing are an integral part of our every day lives, so should they be part of the life of an organization, especially one which attempts to alleviate client needs.

Ralph Tyler (1) said that any educational progam needs to answer four questions in establishing a program. These programs are:

1. WHY? ... What needs can you identify that justify the existence of this educational program ?
2. WHAT? ... What are your objectives in the program? i.e., what objectives will the program accomplish to meet the needs identified under "why"?
3. HOW? ... How will you have the program function to meet its objectives?

4. HOW WILL YOU KNOW? ... What kinds of information would be gathered so that you know if the HOW is meeting the what for the Why?

Too often as educators we have been guilty of overlooking the student need or organizational need, the why question, and progress directly to how. A new special teacher is hired or team teaching is introduced into the system with little thought at to why. A plan that is developed with an inadequate needs assessment relies almost entirely on "how" rather than "whys."

The Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation defines a needs assessment as a process by which one identifies needs and decides upon the priorities among them. A need is a problem which occurs because of the existence of a discrepancy that should not be there, a discrepancy that should be zero (2). The discrepancy can be between two groups in a variable, e.g., test scores achieved by males are lower than test scores achieved by females, or the discrepancy may be between two states the "actual" state and the "ideal" state.

A needs assessment is a process undertaken to determine the existence and/or the extent of a perceived discrepancy. It is a "snapshot" of the needs that currently exist and the assessment lists these needs and the interrelationships among the needs. In short, the needs assessment provides a diagnosis from which a prescription can be made.

Two major methods of needs assessing have been devised to provide data, depending whether the perceived discrepancy is between two groups, or between an ideal situation and an actual situation. The former type of discrepancy may present a problem for the organization and needs assessing process known as the Competency Model.

The process steps in the Problem Analysis Method are:

1. Identifying and Refining the Problem
2. Finding Evidence to Support the Problem Statement
3. Determining the Needs
4. Classifying and Prioritizing the Needs

1. Identifying and Refining the Problem

Let us assume that in our educational setting the males consistently achieve lower than the females on the final math exams. Some states, "The males need extra help on math. We should schedule remedial work for all of our boys." It is a human tendency to jump directly to a solution. We have a discrepancy, a definite problem, but is it the problem we should attack. The next step is to refine the identified problem. Often there is a more fundamental problem than the one initially stated. For example, probing questions should should be asked. "Do all the boys achieve lower or just a few?" Do all the ones that are low achievers have the same teacher?" "Are there any other similarities among the boys who achieve at a lower level?" By probing and refining the initially stated problem we may find that the proper problem statement is: "the males in the third and fourth grades are achieving lower than normal and by averaging their scores in with the rest of the school, the males as a whole appear to be achieving lower than the females."

2. Finding Evidence to Support the Problem Statement

Is the problem as stated actually a problem, or just something one person is upset with or has occurred only once? There must be evidence to support the allegations. At this time in the process some important indepth research should occur. Checking into individual test scores; asking questions of people

directly involved; reviewing procedures that have led up to the situation.

3. Determining the Needs

If from your probing you discover that there is a correctly stated problem important enough to be solved, it is time to determine what needs to happen to solve it. Let us assume we have found that the boys in the third and fourth grade are low math achievers because the teacher in the third grade spends much less time remediating math problems for the boys than for the girls.

Obviously something has to be done to change the situation. Solutions often require several changes and there are normally several possible change combinations. In determining the needs, as many as possible of the alternate solutions should be listed.

4. Classifying and Prioritizing the Needs

The listing of needs developed in step three should be classified into those needs that can be taken care of by someone learning something and those that have to be solved in some other way. The need for more time is not a learning need; the effective use of time is. Other examples might be:

Learning Needs	Non-Learning Needs
Use of time	New teacher
Attitude toward males	Rescheduling boys
Organizing work	Remediation
Achieving objectives	Inadequate salary

You now have listed your potential tasks, but some may not be feasible or time and money may not permit carrying them out. The list of needs should be ranked in priority order. The pattern of changes contained in the solutions may support the priorities. Your specific objectives to approaching a solution

to the problem can be written from the prioritized list of needs.

The Competency Model method of needs assessing is used when there is a discrepancy between an ideal state of affairs and an actual state of affairs. This first stage in this process is the development of the requirements included in the ideal state. Subsequent steps lead to a specification of what needs to be learned to meet the standard of that model. These needs are then ranked in order of priority. This method is not primarily concerned with what is wrong but with what is possible.

The Process Steps

1. Developing a Competency Model
2. Classifying and Prioritizing the Competencies in the Model
3. Assessing Present Levels of Performance
4. Prioritizing the Actual Needs

1. Developing a Competency Model

This first task is to define the competencies or behaviors that compare the ideal state. In order to develop a model, the behaviors must be clearly established. For example, suppose that you believe that the environment in your classroom would be greatly enhanced if all the students had an understanding and skills in group dynamics. As their teacher you could just begin to teach them the skills and understandings, but thay may not be their need, nor would you know exactly where to begin.

You would begin to assess the actual needs of the students by developing a model of competent student of group dynamics and list all understandings and skills that would comprise a model student.

If you as a teacher are an expert on group dynamics you may be able to sit down at your desk, take pen in hand, and list the set of understandings and skills that would comprise your competency model. Most of us are not able

to do that. Invariably we miss some steps, some potential behaviors and when we come to the point of assessing needs we do not get accurate information. Therefore, to expand your input and to assume that you have thought of all possible steps, it is important to have other persons involved in some way.

These might include:

a) Brainstorming Techniques: Because of the variety of experiences and perceptions in all of us, to use a technique such as brainstorming to get as much input as possible will provide a greater amount of potential competencies than one person could possible achieve.

b) Delphi Techniques: It may not be possible to get a panel of experts to sit with you and brainstorm, but you can send them letters. In Delphi techniques, you ask several experts to list a limited set of objectives they feel are essential for reaching the desired model. After synthesizing the list to eliminate redundant answers, you have the experts rate the list and add any behaviors or steps that have not been previously stated. From this activity you should derive a good listing of potential competencies.

c) Literature Search: Many times the information you need has been written for years, all you need do is find it. The search is not an easy task, but at least you have expanded your input.

Other ways of expanding your input to the Competency Model are:

- consulting competent practioners
- watching competent practitioners
- conducting relevant research (Pilot study)
- asking prospective participants

Actually a combintation of all these techniques would best facilitate the development of a complete list of competencies, but time and energy will probably limit you to just one or two.

2. Classifying and Prioritizing the Competencies in the Model

The list of competencies developed from step one should be classified as learning needs, non-learning needs, skills, and understandings. Further, this process may suggest a logical learning sequence leading from simple to more complex competencies. Other factors that should be considered in prioritizing are cost of instruction, time for instructions and organizational needs. These factors often eliminate those competencies that are extremely difficult to achieve.

3. Assessing Present Levels of Performance

In this step we are trying to discover just how competent the prospective learners are at present in relation to our competency model. This determines the actual state of affairs and is the least of the needs assessment process. You want to design an instrument or procedure that will tell you how available the competencies are among the students at this point in time. In other words, how much skill and understanding do the students already have about group dynamics.

The collection of this information can be accomplished through the use of many different techniques.

a) Observing student behavior in the classroom: This is obviously the best measure. The difficulty lies in isolating a particular behavior for observation and in deciding whether inadequate behavior is due to a lack of competency or to some other variable.

b) Testing students: This may get a measure of the understandings about the subject but it will miss those competencies which are skill oriented.

c) Asking students (interviews, surveys, and questionnaires): This may yield mixed results, depending upon the age of the students, the trust they

have in the teacher, and whether an adequate question format has been provided. Still this method is the one most often used and the one most people think of when the term needs assessment is used.

4. Prioritizing the Actual Needs

From the results of your information collection procedures you will be able to determine how many of your students have an understanding of group dynamics and to what degree. Your task now is to describe what is needed for participants to reach the desired level of the competency model. This process will be considerably easy if you have specified the behaviors clearly in the model.

We have now accomplished the "why" of the four Tyler questions. The next step is to develop objectives (what) to attain the meeting of the needs we have identified.

References

1. Tyler, Ralph, Course Syllabus at the University of Chicago, 1950. found in Gottman, J.M., and Clasen, R.E., Evaluation in Education: A Practitioner's Guide, Peacock Publishers, Ilaska, Ill., 1972.

2. Gottman, J.M., and Clasen, R.E., Evaluation in Education: A Practitioner's Guide, Peacock Publishers, Ilaska, Ill., 1972.

3. Davis, Lary Nolan, Planning, Conducting, Evaluation Workshops, Learning Concepts, Austin, Texas, 1972.

ASSESSMENT IN NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT INSTITUTIONS

PRESENTER: Ralph Sims - Assistant Director, Title I, New Jersey

The problem of assessing students in the institutions pose problems which do not occur in the regular school systems. In addition to the issues of accuracy of instruments, preparation of staff to use the instruments and the results of tests, the poor correlation between the test and the instructional program to mention a few; there is also the difficulty in Neglected Delinquent institutions of the assessment of the population with very unique characteristics. First, the fact that the students are at different levels with different abilities, and having been exposed to different instructional techniques. The short period of time the students will be in many of the facilities makes assessment and instruction difficult if not almost impossible. There is generally no consistency of measure or standard of achievement in the various institutions serving students. This also means there is no uniform record keeping system among the various agencies. In some cases there are no records. The student going from one institution to the other or from an institution to the school system normally has little recorded information about the level of performance or knowledge. This is critical if the student will be in and out or enters the program of the agency long after it has started with other students.

Let us not deal at this point with the in-servicing of teachers and administrators or with the technical problems of tests. The concern I have is broader than that for institutions with which we work. The problem simply stated is to devise a comprehensive system which will enable us to get accurate information almost instantly about the students educational experience and level of achievement. The system must ust terminology, forms, standards which we

must jointly agree to use. It must be simple, easy to operate, and to record and retrieve information. It is easier to discuss this and to propose the development and the installation of such a system. But let us first agree that this approach is necessary or desireable before we discuss the how. If we truly believe that the educational programs we use are based on an accurate assessment of students, and if we believe that we do not have a consistent way to record or transmit information about students, then we must make some basic changes in the way we individually assess and jointly assess.

The question of the mechanics of a system should be raised. For if we do not agree that what we have can be improved, then we must deal with the reality determining if such an ambitious approach can be made operational. We are dealing with diverse agencies both public and private, with different sources of dollars and regulations, and with different populations of students. We know the problems of coordinating by experience. My response is that we can and must take stpes to develop a more logical approach to assessment in the agencies we represent.

The Exhibit A I will present for your consideration currently exists in its infancy in the Migrant Education program under Title I, ESEA. The same problem of transient population, diversity of agencies, differences in priority exist in that program also. We can use this as an example of what can be done. What coordinates the efforts of the agencies and provides accurate information is first an agreement by the States and the operating agencies on some basic things; the reporting system, terminology, and the need to coordinate to prevent duplication and over and under assessment. What has been done is the development of an agreed upon list of reading and math skills students should have. The records are kept in this format rather than raw scores, percentiles, NCE's, stanines or grade equivalents. It just gives information on what students

can do and cannot do. In the math program it identifies skills students have mastered. This is not a revolutionary idea. It is a revolutionary trust in the coordination of diverse agency cooperation. It also gives information which can be used directly for instruction when it is received and forces us to all speak the same language.

I am not asking for a universal test for institutions, but rather a system which can accurately record and transmit information about the skills we teach. Such a system would force us to look at the student and work together in a consistent fashion to educate them. We should be working together anyway. After all they are probably the same students.

FROM THE MATH LAB DESIGN TO THE YOUTH IN THE MATH LAB

PRESENTERS: Pamela Culver - Math Lab Instructor, Tyron School
Johnstown, NY

Jonathan Panzer - Math Lab Instructor, South Lansing Center
South Lansing, NY

Clementine DiCarlo - Department for Youth, Coordinator of
Math Programs

The thrust of this presentation is to:

1. Provide participants with an overview of the DFY Title I funded Math Lab Design approved by the NYS Education Department; and

2. Take the participants from the written design through a functioning Math Lab as experienced by the youth in need of this special service.

Included in this paper is a description of the Math Lab Design along with relevant past and present information about the DFY Math Program.

DFY TITLE I MATH LAB DESIGN

DFY Title I Math Labs are designed to provide supplemental instruction to meet the diagnosed needs of the youth who has been identified as in need of remedial Math instruction. Participants, between the ages of 13-17, are instructed in a remedial mathematics laboratory environment.

The DFY Math Lab is an instructional system which enables the teacher to identify each student's Math needs and to prescribe appropriate instructional activities to meet those needs. Through this system, one teacher (together with a full or part-time assistant) instructs at least six youth per class session, addressing their individual Math needs. These Math needs range from basic Math skills and concepts through elementary concepts in algebra.

Included in this system are certain basic components which are part of each Math Lab in the Division despite its size and/or number of youth served. These

components include:

1. Math Resources - Included in this component are the human, material and environmental resources.

   Human - Each Lab is staffed with a teacher who has NYS Certification in Math.

   Material - the Labs are provided with a basic set of materials selected to include the range of skills to be taught and to reflect the diversity of learning approaches (texts; audio & visual; programmed; manipulatives, etc.).

   Environmental - for the most part, Lab spaces have been planned to "look" as non-traditional as possible. The areas are carpeted, have colorful window drapes, tables and chairs for large and small group instruction, individual learning areas, activity sections, and in some cases, a metric corner.

2. Management Resources - This includes a Math Lab Manual and a Math Prescription Notebook.

   The Math Lab Manual - contains the following:

   A. Outline of the diagnostic/prescriptive/individualized approach used in the Labs.

   B. Duties and responsibilities of the Lab Instructor and the assistant.

   C. Description of the contents of the teacher folder as well as the student folder.

   D. Samples of teacher and student forms.

   E. List of Math Skills.

   F. Data Collection and Reporting Information.

   G. Student Orientation Booklet.

   H. Names and Addresses of DFY Title I Math Lab Instructors.

   The Math Prescription Notebook - is a listing of the one hundred fifty-five skills or behaviors taught in the Lab and correlated to Math materials which may be prescribed for teaching each skill. Also included is the pre-post criterion referenced test identification number used to test for mastery of each objective.

3. Staff Development and Support System - Title I Math Lab teachers attend an In-Service Training conducted by the DFY Math Program Coordinator on an annual basis. Teachers are trained in the use of the diagnostics/prescriptive

approach used in the Labs. This training is continued and supported throughout each year by the on-going contact with the DFY Math Program Coordinator through on-site visits, phone contacts, central memoranda, regional meetings, and facility visits. State Education Department persons from the Title I Office, as well as the Math Bureaus, as part of the support system, visit DFY facilities and provide necessary assistance and feedback to the Math Program Coordinator.

RELEVANT INFORMATION

The New York State Division for Youth Title I Math Lab Program served youth in residential facilities which range in size from 20 bed units to 120 beds. For the most part, these youth receive their total education program within the facility in which they reside from certified teachers employed by the Division. Title I programs in these facilities, supplement the youth's basic state purpose funded education program.

Some youth are placed in the smaller 7 bed group home units. These youth attend the local community schools and are involved in Title I Tutorial Programs usually held in the afternoons or evenings.

The Title I Math Labs serve approximately 2,000 different youth ranging from grade 1 to grade 9 in Math achievement levels: It is hypothesized that 75 percent of the target population in Math will demonstrate mastery of the specific objectives upon which they worked.

Instructional periods range from 45-60 minutes in length with a minimum of three sessions per week for each youth. Screening results indicate that 85 percent of DFY youth fall over 2 years behind grade level in Math. Analysis of past data indicate that 77 percent of the objectives worked upon in Math were successfully mastered. Overall, the individual diagnostic/prescriptive approach seems to have worked well in Math usually resulting in appropriate prescriptions for instruction and providing subsequent learning experiences for participating youth.

OVERVIEW OF REMEDIAL MATHEMATICS: OVERVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

PRESENTER: Lynn Richbart - Associate, N.Y.S. Bureau of Math Education

My presentation at the April 25-27, 1979, Neglected and Delinquent conference began with a brief overview of Remedial Mathematics Program Considerations as described on the attached sheet. During the discussion the audience had the opportunity to participate in several activities. These included the following:

Diagnosis: Sets of exercises with obvious incorrect answers were examined to determine if a systematic error had occurred and if so, what the error was.

Example:

32	50	24
- 6	- 8	- 5
34	58	21

In all three problems the student merely subtracted the greater digit from the lessor, no matter where it was located.

Methodologies: The state publication "Ideas for Strengthening Mathematics Skills" was used to investigate some alternative approaches to standard algorithms (rules for computation). The object was to foster student interest and provide practice situations for the conventional algorithm.

Example: To multiply 19 by 104 construct a table the following way. For each new entry take half of one factor (disregarding remainders) and double the other. Continue until 1 is reached using the halving process. Cross out all entries having an even number in the halving side. Add the remaining doubling column entries for your product.

19	X104
9	208
~~4~~	~~416~~
~~2~~	~~832~~
1	1664
	1976

Check answer by multiplying 19 x 104 the conventional way.

REMEDIAL MATHEMATICS PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS

I PLANNED COURSE - Know where you're going

A. LIMITS - Will the remedial program emphasize computation, concept development, or problem solving?

B. DEPTH - Will the remedial program support the entire scope of a topic or merely the basic fundamentals?

C. RECORDING INSTRUMENT - Will you develop a skill checklist or use an established curriculum from your district to keep tract of the students' progress?

II DIAGNOSIS - Know where to begin

A. COMMERCIAL TESTS - Will you do an item analysis of a pretest (i.e., achievement test) or use all or portions of a diagnostic or criterion references test? Remember: This follows I.

B. TEACHER DIAGNOSIS - Does the staff have the expertise to identify specific mathematics weaknesses? Are teacher made diagnostic tests reviewed for clarity and accuracy by a competent mathematics educator?

III METHODOLOGIES - Know what to use

A. ALTERNATIVES - Does your remedial program present a topic in a different way from that first not understood? You may want to use manipulative materials to show abstract mathematics concept in a more concrete way. (Laboratory approach) Remember: No one panacea.

B. STRENGTHS - Are you using an approach which is well understood by your staff? There are subtleties in all approaches, tutorial, laboratory, or machine oriented.

C. SUPERVISION - Is someone available to assist remedial staff with methodologies chosen?

IV SUFFICIENT TIME AND LOAD - Know what to expect

A. ADDITIONAL TIME - Does your remedial program offer enough time for noticeable improvement? We recommend 3-5 additional periods per week of remediation.

B. TEACHER LOAD - Can the teacher provide individual help? Once again we recommend class sizes of less than 6 and a total load of no more than 50 for a qualified professional.

V COMMUNICATION - Let everyone involved know what's going on

A. CLASSROOM TEACHER - Does the remedial staff keep the regular classroom teacher informed? Informal communication can become no communication. Use that checklist (section I) and have a student folder available.

B. PARENTS - Do the parents receive information on what's being done for their child? Keep them informed and in fact seek their assistance.

SUPERVISION OF TITLE I PROGRAMS - OVERSEEING FROM THE MIDDLE

PRESENTER: Lynn Gilmore - Title I Project Coordinator

A definition of to supervise is to have charge of directing employees, an operation, etc., to oversee.

Title I Programs within the New York State Department of Correctional Services, similar to other Title I Programs, must produce results within three bureaucracies, or must oversee from the middle.

Title I is a federally-funded program administered by our State Education Department and implemented within the Department of Correctional Services. The missions of these agencies are not always compatible. Within the Department of Correctional Services, the facilities are more autonomous than the centralized program design that the State Education Department allows. The Department of Correctional Services houses convicted felon-adults responsible for their own actions. Federal law discusses children and forces us to make distinctions for purposes of eligibility based on age, regardless of educational need or institutional status. Despite these and other problems of integrating three bureaucracies, Title I Programs in the Department of Correctional Services work.

Program supervision is a major factor. Using the New York State Department of Correctional Services program as a model, the workshop will focus on the role of supervision - how the bureaucrats involved interact.

A discrepancy evaluation model will be presented that includes offering technical assistance and monitoring programs. A data collection and feedback system will be analyzed. Formal and informal student and staff evaluations will be discussed. Budget procedures and the process of student selection will be considered as the operation of Title I Programs as viewed as a dynamic and productive force, maintained through good superivsion, successful, despite having three masters.

TITLE I, ESEA PROJECTS FOR NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN RESIDING IN GROUP HOMES

PRESENTER: Fred Kershko - Associate, Title I, New York State Education Department

A. The Annual Survey of Children in State or local institutions for Neglected or Delinquent Children

1. Each fall the U.S. Office of Education conducts a survey to identify eligible children who can be considered for participation in Title I, ESEA projects.

B. Organization of Title I, ESEA Projects for institutionalized children residing in Group Homes

1. After an annual allocation of funds is established, eligible agencies submit project application to the New York State Education Department for approval.

2. Applications outline the supplementary services in Reading, Mathematics, Bilingual education project participants will receive.

3. Eligible students must be screened at Agency expense to determine if they have special educational needs which the Title I, ESEA project can satisfy.

C. Examples of Group Home programs presently being offered

1. Group Home programs are currently offered during the school day or after school.

2. School day programs must offer supplementary services such as learning laboratory type activities.

3. After school programs provide teachers who instruct students in areas of reading and mathematics curriculum which students must master.

4. Group Home programs usually are required to use a diagnostic prescriptive approach to instruction.

5. Criterion referenced tests are usually used to report student achievement.

D. Problems of Group Home program operations

1. The atmosphere of Group Homes must be conducive to education programs.

2. Group Home parents and staff must support the education program.

3. If at all possible, the Group Home should provide materials and activities which stimulate the students' educational interests.

4. Title I, ESEA project staff and teachers should coordinate their program with the staff and teachers involved in providing students with their basic education program.

5. Required teacher and student records should be maintained and available for inspection.

6. Teachers and students must have an adequate area within the Group Home to carry on their education program.

E. Hints that can help improve Group Home programs

1. Student helpers can assist other students.

2. Adult volunteers can assist teachers and students in the program.

3. Community resources should be used when possible to add interest and variety to projects.

F. Forecast of things to come

1. Congress has extended Title I, ESEA through 1983.

2. How will Group Home programs change, if at all, in the coming years? Changes will, no doubt, take place.

VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS IN CORRECTIONAL SETTINGS

PRESENTER: Tracy Smith - Teacher/Coordination
Training School for Boys, Skillman, New Jersey

The Volunteer Tutoring Program at the Training School for Boys, Skillman, N.J. is designed to provide our students with a wider range of personal and academic experiences that would otherwise ever be possible. We firmly believe that a positive self-concept on the part of a student is a necessary pre-requisite to personal and academic success. Our tutoring program is based on the concept that each student has the right to recieve as much instruction in the basic skills of reading and mathematics as is necessary for him to fulfill his responsibility to himself and society to actively develop, refine, and extend his academic skills to their maximum. Therefore, the program has as its primary objective, the utilization of this positive attribute in the acquisition and mastery of basic reading, mathematics and thinking skills.

We have found that Volunteers are uniquely able to provide positive self-image building experiences for students in a way that is not accessible to staff members. Our students know that Volunteers do not "have to" devote either time or energy to them, and they express amazement that Volunteers continue to come without "getting paid." These are attributes which, by definition, Volunteers alone possess. Students cannot help but reach the inescapable conclusion that they have importance, that in fact they are important enough to impact positively on another person's life. In this way, Volunteers, by their very presence, provide students with an immeasurable sense of personal worth.

Our Volunteers, however, go beyond mere presence and take the opportunity to use their talents where they can have the most impact on a one-to-one academic relationship with our students. While our Volunteers have the freedom to plan

their own individual sessions with their particular students, we remain continually available to provide as much guidance and direction as a particular Volunteer may want or need.

In order to assist all our Volunteers in their efforts to provide success-oriented academic experiences for our students, we provide daily in-service training sessions. Some of these sessions are designed as demonstrations, some are discussions and others are working sessions in which Volunteers have the opportunity to prepare material for use with their particular students. Since our Volunteers have always possessed a tremendous wealth and variety of talent and knowledge, our training sessions provide a forum for individuals to share their ideas and experiences so that all can grow and benefit from the collective expertise of the group. The training sessions are not designed to be comprehensive or exhaustive, but rather, in limited time, we hope to expose Volunteers to the variety of resources available for their use, so as to enhance the time they spend with our students.

Our experience with Volunteers has been tremendously positive and we feel strongly that through interaction with community Volunteers, our students are being provided with enormous opportunities for growth and development that would be otherwise unavailable.

LEA RELATIONSHIP WITH INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS

PRESENTER: Robert Darden - Acting Administrative Coordinator of Federal Programs, Newark Public Schools, New Jersey

Children Served

Title I serves nearly 27,000 youths in three types of State Institutions: those for delinquents, for the neglected, or for adults (but also housing persons under 21 years of age). Of the 621 institutions eligible to receive funds, 437 are found to be participating. Most of those not participating have very few residents eligible for Title I services (that is, under 21 years of age and not high school graduates).

The proportion of eligible students served by Title I varies considerably across institutions and by type of institution. Fewer than half of the eligible students are served in 60% of the facilities for adults; about 40% of institutions for the delinquents or neglected serve fewer than half of their eligible students. Nationwide, 55% of all institutions serve more than half of their eligibles: 20% serve all eligibles.

The children participating in Title I greatly resemble those in the institutions as a whole, except, as would be expected, they are younger. With regard to sex, race, and commitment status, they are not significantly different from the general resident population. Also, their average length of stay is similar to that of the other residents: about 20 months in institutions for the neglected, about 8 months in facilities for delinquents, and about 18 months in those for adults.

Title I Services

The nature of Title I services varies considerably from site to site according to how education, itself, is organized in the facilities. In some

cases, the facility may have the appearance of a junior college campus with security concerns only slightly in evidence. In such a case, residents might be expected to live in small (10-15 persons) cottages and to move freely to other buildings, such as that for classes. On the other hand, a facility with an obvious over-riding orientation toward security might consist merely of a large fenced-in building with two classrooms, perhaps a shop and library, in one wing. Occasionally classes might be held in multi-purpose rooms serving as dining halls or gymnasiums.

Just as the physical setting for education varies substantially, so too do the attention paid to it by staff and the requirements upon residents to take it seriously. In some cases, education in such a facility must, according to State law, be comparable to that of public schools. Residents must attend classes, and their progress is sometimes rewarded by access to better living areas (those with color television, for example) and to special privileges. In such a case, the residents' school day looks much like that in regular schools. In contrast are the institutions in which only a small percentage of the inmates are in education activities, or those (18% of the cases) in which those activities are not accredited by the State.

Hence, education in the institutions varies considerable, and, consequently, so does Title I. Participation in the Title I project can be described in terms of the needs assessment and selection processes, the actual delivery of services, and the evaluation of those services in the institutional setting.

Needs Assessment

Diagnostic testing (either at the institution itself or in a State facility maintained especially for that purpose) is used most frequently to assess resident's needs and to select them for participation in Title I. This testing almost always assesses academic achievement, and may be supplemented by tests for

special learning problems (in half the cases) or by inventories measuring IQ, attitudinal or personality traits.

Services

The Title I services offered to participating children are primarily in the areas of reading and mathematics. Occasionally the services also focus on cultural enrichment, social studies, other academic areas, counseling, or special education. These are viewed as supplementary services offered in addition to the institutions' regular educational programs which are elementary education, a secondary school curriculum, preparation for a General Education Diploma, remedial education other than Title I, special education, and vocational education.

ESEA Title I Workshop on Neglected & Delinquent Children

April 25-27, 1979

Fallsview Hotel, Ellenville, NY

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP EFFECTIVENESS

Please rate each aspect of this workshop according to the value scales provided.

Criterion	Value Scale
1. Overall quality of this workshop.	3.69% ___5 Excellent ___4 ___3 ___2 ___1 Poor
2. The extent to which this workshop met your own needs.	3.31% ___5 Excellent ___4 ___3 ___2 ___1 Poor
3. Relevance of topics to current educational issues or problems.	3.83% ___5 Very Relevant ___4 ___3 ___2 ___1 Not Relevant
4. Success of workshop speaker(s) in presenting program content.	

Reading	Evaluation	Needs	Math	Supervision	Special
4.4%	3.63%	3.44%	4.16%	3.46%	4.10%

___5 Very Successful ___4 ___3 ___2 ___1 Not Successful

5. Usefulness of materials provided.	4.16% ___5 Very Useful ___4 ___3 ___2 ___1 Not Useful ___ Not Practical
6. Potential practicality for implementing methods or ideas discussed.	3.97% ___5 Very Practical ___4 ___3 ___2 ___1 Not Practical

The strongest aspect of this workshop was: _____

_____

The weakest aspect of this workshop was: _____

_____

ESEA Title I Workshop on Neglected & Delinquent Children

April 25-27, 1979

Fallsview Hotel, Ellenville, NY

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP EFFECTIVENESS

5. Usefulness of materials provided.

- Excellent - especially in reading, very rich, creative, extensive variety of useful materials, truly a model program.
- Yes, they can be adapted to my use
- those handouts were good, there just wasn't enough material handed out, need for complete name and address and phone of participants should be made available.
- Would have liked hand-outs of law changes, regulations, etc. What was given out was excellent.
- Reading workshop provided excellent materials.
- Materials were provided in Math and Reading only!!
- very useful resources plus opportunity to meet people who may provide possible resources.
- Only provided in Math and Reading workshops.
- only in Math and Reading workshops did I feel I received a great deal of value. Others were less meaningful for reasons of: my interest level, the ability of the presenters.

6. Potential practicality for implementing methods or ideas discussed.

- *SUPERB! A wealth of ideas. BEST WORKSHOP
- Specifically program design and evaluation procedures.
- Excellent
- Reading - very practical. Some other programs were practical. Many of the administrative methods I can't judge the practicality of.
- Only in Math and Reading
- In reading and math only

The strongest aspect of this workshop was:

- Reading Instruction, presentation of federal rules and regulations, variety of kinds of workshops
- the reading and math seminar. Excellent exchange of ideas and practices.
- Meeting people who work with the same type of youth and sharing.
- Knowledge of programs and projects gained through socializing and informal group interaction.
- The interaction between teachers outside the workshops and the workshops run by people from D.F.Y. - which were excellent.
- No outstanding strength except chance to meet and question presenters further informally because of size of conference.
- Contacts made and individual answers responded to - good organization - attitude of all in attendance - need more cracker barrel - best sessions in class program evaluation and LEA relationship with instructional program.
- Enjoyed reading workshop.

The strongest aspect of this workshop was:

- Reading presentation.
- Meeting the Title I staff and discussing ideas which will help.
- Cracker Barrel
- Its relevance!
- Reading and volunteer programs gave the most practical presentations, very well organized.
- too many
- Meeting people involved with Title I programs.
- Interchange between participants. Samples of information. Opportunity to meet others in related fields.
- Meeting other professionals in the field and exchanging ideas and sharing problems. Useable handouts given by specific speakers.
- The opportunity to have dialogue with individuals from other states and districts.
- The overall coordination of workshops/activities and informality of social discussion.
- The amount of free discussion during and after workshops.
- Excellent preparation of presenters!
- Interaction of people attending conference.
- Reading and Math workshops were excellent. Evaluation and Supervision were good.
- Informal discussions - sometimes these happened at the end of sessions but most discussion was reserved for socializing time - little workshop time was allowed for it.
- Reading and Math Workshops.
- Meeting the different people from various institutes and sharing their ideas and programs.
- Communication. Finding out what others are doing, healthy exchanges of ideas.
- an excellent opportunity to get together with other teachers of the N & D to discuss ideas.
- The presentations which I considered the strongest were the ones presented by Carole Singer, Don, Peggy (Reading); Josh (Math) ; Pam Culver (Math).
- The interchange of ideas with people from various dimensions of N & D facilities and fields.
- Folk involved in N & D were able to come together (Regional feelings shared)
- The ability to get clarity from the "horse's mouth", exchange of ideas with other programs, getting to know administrative needs to run a program.
- Areas pertaining to reading, testing and math, and how they are implemented in various programs.
- Math and Reading Workshops - useful information which could be implemented, materials provided.
- The workshops on Reading and Math by Mr. Richbart, Ms. Singer, Ms. Jeffries, and Mr. Munday.
- Reading, math seminars.

The weakest aspect of this workshop was:

- Math Instruction too systematized, supervision workshop only relevant to drug programs. More practical workshops with teaching strategies best for teachers. Registration of people too haphazard. A need for matching needs of group with information provided by various presenters. Need a little more free time between workshops.

The weakest aspect of this workshop was:

- Evaluation, Needs and Supervision were on a statistically level, would have prefered sometime that is useful in a classroom area.
- No opportunity set aside for more sharing.
- Heterogenous groups did not allow for in depth coverage of subjects according to special interests; schedule did not allow for indepth coverage of one subject if so desired, policy aspects of current issues were not covered - a guide was informative more than analytical.
- Those workshops had speakers where we were lectured at and not involved. Some of the material discussed and presented was very legally technical and not of any immediate relevance to the classroom teacher. Speakers should spend less time trying to be funny and more time being relevant.
- NEEDED A MAP!! Need a session to focus on needs of private schools for N & D. Our problems are different. Also a choice for reading/math people to focus together.
- Some individual presentations were not presented to the point listed in program - More material (Hands-on) should be made available - material that was to be reviewed should be handed to participants rather than read from. Afternoon sessions shouldn't be as long, free time for bull sessions are needed.
- Not enough time for teachers to share experiences.
- Supervision
- Supervision workshop
- Quality of some presentations - groups migh have better been divided according to professional position, i.e. teacher, administrator, private, public.
- Too many presenters simply were not prepared! They began by saying, "I don't know what I'm going to say".
- The Rules & Regulations meetings (But I realize the reason). Overall - this has been a good experience. Thank you for everything.
- Leaders should control the situation so that a few participants don't try to control and go off into areas not of interest to majority and not pertinent to the topic. Suggestions:
  (1)Have "levels" for workshops taking into consideration the backgrounds and experinece of various participants. (I found much of info "elementary").
  (2)Change group composition from session to session - not necessarily a strength having same individuals with each other for the full time - but what grouping there is should be according to (1)
  (3)When asking for participant interests in planning ahead, define your terms carefully.
  In my opinion, the more successful workshops were the ones where the presenter presented - with very little participation.

- No way to check complete listing of workshops to see that ones most valuable could be visited.
- Topic of Handicapped on 4/26/79 was not relevant to most of audiences. Terminology foreign to most.
- Not enough structured group time for teachers to get together to describe their respective facilities, ideas, problems, funding sources, administrative hassles, and reporting systems. Ralph Sims' ideas for coordination and communication at student data is excellent and needs to be pursued.
- No color TV.
- It was too tightly schedule, as well as, many topics were not particularly relevant to everyday program needs.
- The schedule was a little too tight. Reading session with A.R. Sarlo was very good - the only problem was Sarlo's inability to keep questions from leading him astray.

The weakest aspect of this workshop was:

- Participation of audience (i.e. involvement of participants)
- No master schedule of conference was provided if one chose to attend another session.
- Main speakers - Pat Mansini, Leo Denault, John House - could have been better organized, prepared and informative - use of audio visual, handouts of material and content they wished to share could be made available. In teachers - the reality of several workshops in math and reading - could be made available as an alternative to less relevant workshops - ex. Although evaluation was an excellent workshop it was geared to agency administration and not as relevant as an extra math or reading lab.
- Too much focus on administrative aspects of programs, not enough idea sharing among teachers. Presenters of instruction workshops should be instructors themselves currently. I think participants should have been grouped on the basis of their interest - i.e. reading teacher, math teacher, administrator - and spent most of the workhsop sharing ideas with others in their position. It is useful to have some workshops that cut across these lines because often problems can be pinpointed and discussed in these sessions that might not otherwise come to light. But I was not satisfied with this being the main thrust of three days of workshops. There was also too much throwing around of letters and numbers to designate programs and laws that not all conference participants were familiar with. This evaluation sheet would be more useful if you had names of presenters next to workshop. The presentations would probably have also been better if presenters has had more time to prepare and known more about the background and interest of conference participants. There should have been more participant choice in workshops.
- Most information presented was not relevant to me as an educator. I found the Math and Reading (Richbart - Jeffriss, Singer, Munday) workshop extremely relevant and stimulating. The workshops should be split up into supervisory, administration and educators.
- The food.
- Tight scheduling. Non relevant material presented to everyone should be restricted to people for whom such material was relevant.
- Seemed like some of the presenters and speakers were not well prepared, would have liked to have a master schedule to better have picked workshops.
- Tight scheduling and lack of adequate opportunity for participant input especially in the forms of discussion group and individual presentations.
- Scheduled persons on program were not available (substitutes). Many we had heard about in the field and disappointed for them not to be here.
- Wasn't enough time for sharing with other programs.
- Areas which did not really pertain to my job such as some of the regulations and supervision seminars.
- As a teacher, I found most of the workshops not relevant and felt they were geared toward administration. I would have appreciated workshops concerning new ideas, methods of teaching and materials, as well as a sharing of experiences with other teachers (how they function in their work environments as opposed to the rest of their facilities).
- Most workshops were geared toward administration, not toward teachers.
- (1) Not allowing people to choose themselves the seminars that they attend. I would not have chosen rule and regulations, supervision, etc. and would have chosen more than one reading, math group. I'm sure others would have reversed the process. Too tightly scheduled the first day!
  (2) It also would have been a great "kick-off" to get an "inspirational" speaker in the field of keynote speaker.
  (3) Better inform speakers who their audiences will be. Some apparently expected only administrators.
  (4) General, total group presentations were not well thought-out.